

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9

10 Northern District of California

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

NORMA J. WINGATE,

18 Plaintiff,

v.

19 PATRICK DONAHOE, POSTMASTER  
20 GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

21 Defendant.

22 No. C 12-05560 LB  
23 No. C 13-01722 LB

24 **ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS  
TO DISMISS**

25 **INTRODUCTION**

26 The order addresses motions to dismiss the amended complaints in two related actions filed by  
27 *pro se* Plaintiff Norma J. Wingate, a former United States Postal Service (“USPS”) employee,  
28 against Patrick Donahoe, Postmaster General of the United States,<sup>1</sup> for employment discrimination  
based on her race, national origin, sex, and color, and for a hostile work environment. In both Case  
No. 12-05560 LB (“*Wingate I*”), and Case No. 13-01722 LB (“*Wingate II*”), Ms. Wingate seeks  
declaratory and injunctive relief, lost compensation, compensatory damages, attorney’s fees, and  
costs. *See Wingate I*, First Amended Complaint (“FAC”), ECF No. 26; *Wingate II*, FAC, ECF No.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
5540  
5541  
5542  
5543  
5544  
5545  
5546  
5547  
5548  
5549  
5550  
5551  
5552  
5553  
5554  
5555  
5556  
5557  
5558  
5559  
55510  
55511  
55512  
55513  
55514  
55515  
55516  
55517  
55518  
55519  
55520  
55521  
55522  
55523  
55524  
55525  
55526  
55527  
55528  
55529  
55530  
55531  
55532  
55533  
55534  
55535  
55536  
55537  
55538  
55539  
55540  
55541  
55542  
55543  
55544  
55545  
55546  
55547  
55548  
55549  
55550  
55551  
55552  
55553  
55554  
55555  
55556  
55557  
55558  
55559  
555510  
555511  
555512  
555513  
555514  
555515  
555516  
555517  
555518  
555519  
555520  
555521  
555522  
555523  
555524  
555525  
555526  
555527  
555528  
555529  
555530  
555531  
555532  
555533  
555534  
555535  
555536  
555537  
555538  
555539  
555540  
555541  
555542  
555543  
555544  
555545  
555546  
555547  
555548  
555549  
555550  
555551  
555552  
555553  
555554  
555555  
555556  
555557  
555558  
555559  
5555510  
5555511  
5555512  
5555513  
5555514  
5555515  
5555516  
5555517  
5555518  
5555519  
5555520  
5555521  
5555522  
5555523  
5555524  
5555525  
5555526  
5555527  
5555528  
5555529  
5555530  
5555531  
5555532  
5555533  
5555534  
5555535  
5555536  
5555537  
5555538  
5555539  
5555540  
5555541  
5555542  
5555543  
5555544  
5555545  
5555546  
5555547  
5555548  
5555549  
5555550  
5555551  
5555552  
5555553  
5555554  
5555555  
5555556  
5555557  
5555558  
5555559  
55555510  
55555511  
55555512  
55555513  
55555514  
55555515  
55555516  
55555517  
55555518  
55555519  
55555520  
55555521  
55555522  
55555523  
55555524  
55555525  
55555526  
55555527  
55555528  
55555529  
55555530  
55555531  
55555532  
55555533  
55555534  
55555535  
55555536  
55555537  
55555538  
55555539  
55555540  
55555541  
55555542  
55555543  
55555544  
55555545  
55555546  
55555547  
55555548  
55555549  
55555550  
55555551  
55555552  
55555553  
55555554  
55555555  
55555556  
55555557  
55555558  
55555559  
555555510  
555555511  
555555512  
555555513  
555555514  
555555515  
555555516  
555555517  
555555518  
555555519  
555555520  
555555521  
555555522  
555555523  
555555524  
555555525  
555555526  
555555527  
555555528  
555555529  
555555530  
555555531  
555555532  
555555533  
555555534  
555555535  
555555536  
555555537  
555555538  
555555539  
555555540  
555555541  
555555542  
555555543  
555555544  
555555545  
555555546  
555555547  
555555548  
555555549  
555555550  
555555551  
555555552  
555555553  
555555554  
555555555  
555555556  
555555557  
555555558  
555555559  
5555555510  
5555555511  
5555555512  
5555555513  
5555555514  
5555555515  
5555555516  
5555555517  
5555555518  
5555555519  
5555555520  
5555555521  
5555555522  
5555555523  
5555555524  
5555555525  
5555555526  
5555555527  
5555555528  
5555555529  
5555555530  
5555555531  
5555555532  
5555555533  
5555555534  
5555555535  
5555555536  
5555555537  
5555555538  
5555555539  
5555555540  
5555555541  
5555555542  
5555555543  
5555555544  
5555555545  
5555555546  
5555555547  
5555555548  
5555555549  
5555555550  
5555555551  
5555555552  
5555555553  
5555555554  
5555555555  
5555555556  
5555555557  
5555555558  
5555555559  
55555555510  
55555555511  
55555555512  
55555555513  
55555555514  
55555555515  
55555555516  
55555555517  
55555555518  
55555555519  
55555555520  
55555555521  
55555555522  
55555555523  
55555555524  
55555555525  
55555555526  
55555555527  
55555555528  
55555555529  
55555555530  
55555555531  
55555555532  
55555555533  
55555555534  
55555555535  
55555555536  
55555555537  
55555555538  
55555555539  
55555555540  
55555555541  
55555555542  
55555555543  
55555555544  
55555555545  
55555555546  
55555555547  
55555555548  
55555555549  
55555555550  
55555555551  
55555555552  
55555555553  
55555555554  
55555555555  
55555555556  
55555555557  
55555555558  
55555555559  
555555555510  
555555555511  
555555555512  
555555555513  
555555555514  
555555555515  
555555555516  
555555555517  
555555555518  
555555555519  
555555555520  
555555555521  
555555555522  
555555555523  
555555555524  
555555555525  
555555555526  
555555555527  
555555555528  
555555555529  
555555555530  
555555555531  
555555555532  
555555555533  
555555555534  
555555555535  
555555555536  
555555555537  
555555555538  
555555555539  
555555555540  
555555555541  
555555555542  
555555555543  
555555555544  
555555555545  
555555555546  
555555555547  
555555555548  
555555555549  
555555555550  
555555555551  
555555555552  
555555555553  
555555555554  
555555555555  
555555555556  
555555555557  
555555555558  
555555555559  
5555555555510  
5555555555511  
5555555555512  
5555555555513  
5555555555514  
5555555555515  
5555555555516  
5555555555517  
5555555555518  
5555555555519  
5555555555520  
5555555555521  
5555555555522  
5555555555523  
5555555555524  
5555555555525  
5555555555526  
5555555555527  
5555555555528  
5555555555529  
5555555555530  
5555555555531  
5555555555532  
5555555555533  
5555555555534  
5555555555535  
5555555555536  
5555555555537  
5555555555538  
5555555555539  
5555555555540  
5555555555541  
5555555555542  
5555555555543  
5555555555544  
5555555555545  
5555555555546  
5555555555547  
5555555555548  
5555555555549  
5555555555550  
5555555555551  
5555555555552  
5555555555553  
5555555555554  
5555555555555  
5555555555556  
5555555555557  
5555555555558  
5555555555559  
55555555555510  
55555555555511  
55555555555512  
55555555555513  
55555555555514  
55555555555515  
55555555555516  
55555555555517  
55555555555518  
55555555555519  
55555555555520  
55555555555521  
55555555555522  
55555555555523  
55555555555524  
55555555555525  
55555555555526  
55555555555527  
55555555555528  
55555555555529  
55555555555530  
55555555555531  
55555555555532  
55555555555533  
55555555555534  
55555555555535  
55555555555536  
55555555555537  
55555555555538  
55555555555539  
55555555555540  
55555555555541  
55555555555542  
55555555555543  
55555555555544  
55555555555545  
55555555555546  
55555555555547  
55555555555548  
55555555555549  
55555555555550  
55555555555551  
55555555555552  
55555555555553  
55555555555554  
55555555555555  
55555555555556  
55555555555557  
55555555555558  
55555555555559  
555555555555510  
555555555555511  
555555555555512  
555555555555513  
555555555555514  
555555555555515  
555555555555516  
555555555555517  
555555555555518  
555555555555519  
555555555555520  
555555555555521  
555555555555522  
555555555555523  
555555555555524  
555555555555525  
555555555555526  
555555555555527  
555555555555528  
555555555555529  
555555555555530  
555555555555531  
555555555555532  
555555555555533  
555555555555534  
555555555555535  
555555555555536  
555555555555537  
555555555555538  
555555555555539  
555555555555540  
555555555555541  
555555555555542  
555555555555543  
555555555555544  
555555555555545  
555555555555546  
555555555555547  
555555555555548  
555555555555549  
555555555555550  
555555555555551  
555555555555552  
555555555555553  
555555555555554  
555555555555555  
555555555555556  
555555555555557  
555555555555558  
555555555555559  
5555555555555510  
5555555555555511  
5555555555555512  
5555555555555513  
5555555555555514  
5555555555555515  
5555555555555516  
5555555555555517  
5555555555555518  
5555555555555519  
5555555555555520  
5555555555555521  
5555555555555522  
5555555555555523  
5555555555555524  
5555555555555525  
5555555555555526  
5555555555555527  
5555555555555528  
5555555555555529  
5555555555555530  
5555555555555531  
5555555555555532  
5555555555555533  
5555555555555534  
5555555555555535  
5555555555555536  
5555555555555537  
5555555555555538  
5555555555555539  
5555555555555540  
5555555555555541  
5555555555555542  
5555555555555543  
5555555555555544  
5555555555555545  
5555555555555546  
5555555555555547  
5555555555555548  
5555555555555549  
5555555555555550  
5555555555555551  
5555555

1 15.<sup>2</sup> On August 28, 2013, the USPS moved to dismiss all of Ms. Wingate's claims in both cases.  
 2 See *Wingate I*, Motion, ECF No. 19; *Wingate II*, Motion, ECF No. 16. For the reasons discussed  
 3 below, the court **GRANTS** the USPS's motions to dismiss **WITH PREJUDICE**.<sup>3</sup>

4 **STATEMENT<sup>4</sup>**

5 **I. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS & PROCEDURAL HISTORIES**

6 **A. Wingate I**

7 **1. EEO Proceedings in Wingate I<sup>5</sup>**

8 On December 24, 2009, Ms. Wingate filed a formal EEO Complaint of Discrimination with the  
 9 USPS's Equal Employment Opportunity ("EEO") office. *Id.* ¶ 2; *see* Tam Decl. Ex. A, ECF No. 26-  
 10 2. She alleged that "Manager Sharon Gray and USPS" discriminated against her "based on Race  
 11 (African-American), Color (Black), Sex (Female), National Origin (Unspecified), Age (DOB:  
 12 3/3/39), Mental Disability (Stress) and Retaliation (Prior EEO Activity)." *Id.* at 9 (letter restating  
 13 Ms. Wingate's allegations); *see id.*<sup>6</sup>

14 Ms. Wingate's EEO complaint alleged that she was off work from August 26 to September 14,  
 15 2009, due to "Harassment and a Hostile Work environment on Job Stress." *Id.* at 3, 9. On

---

17 <sup>2</sup> Citations are to the Electronic Case File ("ECF") with pin cites to the electronically-  
 18 generated page number at the top of the document.

19 <sup>3</sup> Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil Local Rule 7-6, the court finds this matter suitable for  
 20 determination without oral argument and vacates the October 3, 2013 hearing in this matter.

21 <sup>4</sup> The factual allegations and procedural history below are taken from Ms. Wingate's First  
 22 Amended Complaints. The court also considers the documents attached to the Tam Declaration in  
 23 *Wingate I*, ECF No. 26, and the Desorbo Declaration in *Wingate II*, ECF No. 16-1, because the  
 24 USPS's motions to dismiss challenge the factual bases for jurisdiction and because Ms. Wingate has  
 25 not objected to this evidence. *See generally*, Opp'n, ECF No. 28; *see also infra* at 8-9.

26 <sup>5</sup> The court's previous order dismissing all of the claims in Ms. Wingate's original  
 27 complaints recounted in detail the history of Ms. Wingate's EEO proceedings. *See Wingate I*,  
 28 Order, ECF No. 23 at 1-5; *Wingate II*, Order, ECF No. 13 at 1-3. The court incorporates those  
 discussions by reference and summarizes them below.

29 <sup>6</sup> Ms. Wingate's amended complaint does not allege discrimination based on age, disability,  
 30 or retaliation. *See generally* FAC. Accordingly, the court finds that Ms. Wingate has abandoned  
 these claims.

1 September 16, 2009, Sharon Gray gave Ms. Wingate a new job assignment, but Ms. Wingate refused  
2 to accept the change. *Id.* at 5. Gray then told Ms. Wingate not to return to work and placed her in a  
3 “no pay status (LWOP)” for her August 26 to September 14, 2009 absence and from September 16,  
4 2009 forward. *Id.* at 5, 9.

5 The USPS ruled that Ms. Wingate failed to establish that she was subject to discrimination or  
6 retaliation, and she appealed the decision to the Merit Systems Protection Board. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 3-4;  
7 Tam Decl. Ex. B. She later filed a second appeal challenging her removal from the Postal Service.  
8 *See* Compl. ¶ 6; Tam Decl. Ex. D. The appeals were joined and addressed at a hearing on May 16-  
9 17, 2011. *See id.* The MSPB ruled in Ms. Wingate’s favor on the removal issue, ordered the USPS  
10 to reinstate her, and awarded back pay. *See id.*; Tam Decl. Ex. E. The MSPB also held (both  
11 initially and upon review) that Ms. Wingate failed to establish any evidence of discrimination or  
12 retaliation. Tam Decl. Exs. D-E.

13 **2. *Wingate I* in Federal Court**

14 On October 30, 2012, Ms. Wingate filed suit in this court. *See* Complaint, ECF No. 1. Her  
15 original complaint alleged that the USPS discriminated against her in violation of Title VII with  
16 respect to her race or color, sex, and national origin. *See* Complaint ¶¶ 3-5. She explained that the  
17 discrimination claims were an appeal of the MSPB decision against her. *See* Compl., ECF No. 1-3  
18 at 1. In addition, Ms. Wingate alleged that the USPS failed to comply with the MSPB decision  
19 ordering her reinstatement, and she sought to enforce that order. *See id.*, ECF No. 1-1 at 1-2. These  
20 “petition for enforcement” allegations were that the USPS improperly deducted and withheld funds  
21 from her back pay award, interfered with the delivery of her award checks, denied her bonuses, and  
22 refused to correct her attendance records. *See* Order, ECF No. 23 at 4. Ms. Wingate also made  
23 cursory allegations referencing claims including fraud, extortion, invasion of privacy, conspiracy,  
24 extortion, stalking and Fourteenth Amendment and due process violations. *Id., passim*; Order, ECF  
25 No. 23 at 4-5.

26 On July 23, 2013, the court dismissed all of Ms. Wingate’s claims. *See id.* at 15. The court  
27 dismissed with prejudice Ms. Wingate’s tort claims based on defamation, extortion, fraud, and  
28 invasion of privacy because they were barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity. *Id.* The court

1 dismissed the remaining claims without prejudice. *Id.* With respect to any tort claims that fell  
2 within an exception to sovereign immunity, Ms. Wingate failed to exhaust the administrative  
3 remedies required by the Federal Tort Claims Act. *Id.* at 13.

4 The court also dismissed for lack of jurisdiction any Title VII claims based on allegations that  
5 were not presented to the MSPB, including claims that the USPS or its employees harassed Ms.  
6 Wingate, discriminated against her, or retaliated against her after the MSPB ruling. *Id.* at 10.

7 With regard to the discrimination claims that were presented to the MSPB, the court found that  
8 Ms. Wingate failed to allege any facts showing that similarly-situated individuals outside her  
9 protected class were treated more favorably. *Id.* at 11 (race, sex, and national origin discrimination),  
10 12 (age discrimination under the ADEA); 13 (harassment, hostile work environment, and retaliation  
11 claims).

12 **3. Allegations in *Wingate I* FAC**

13 Ms. Wingate filed her First Amended Complaint on August 28, 2013. *See* FAC, ECF No. 25. In  
14 it, Ms. Wingate alleges that she is an “Afro-American (Black)” female, a United States citizen, and a  
15 resident of San Francisco County. *See* FAC, ¶ 11. Defendant Patrick Donahoe is the Postmaster  
16 General of the United States and an employer within the meaning of Title VII. *Id.* ¶ 13.

17 On August 13, 2009, Sharon Gray, the manager of the Bayview Station post office, asked Ms.  
18 Wingate if she wanted “to replace her as the Bayview Station Manager.” *Id.* ¶ 14. Ms. Wingate  
19 asked Gray if someone would then be hired to take Ms. Wingate’s place as Delivery Service (letter  
20 carrier) Supervisor, if she accepted this new position. *Id.* ¶ 15. Gray responded that no one would  
21 replace Ms. Wingate and that she would be covering both positions. *See id.* Gray said that Ms.  
22 Wingate could ask either Gray’s supervisor or the Postmaster for a replacement Delivery Service  
23 Supervisor, though that did not follow the proper chain of command. *See id.*

24 According to Ms. Wingate, USPS employees were not asked to cover both of these positions at  
25 the same time and none of the other Bayview replacement managers were asked to cover both  
26 supervisor and manager positions at the same time. *Id.* None of the replacement managers were  
27 African-American or Black. *Id.* ¶ 17.

28 During a previous three-week period, Ms. Wingate had covered both positions at the same time.

1 *See id.* ¶¶ 18-19. Because the Acting Manager and Delivery Service Supervisor jobs had different  
2 schedules, Ms. Wingate had been required to work 12-hour days during this period. *See id.* ¶ 18.  
3 Because she was not approved to work such long hours, though, she was not paid for all of the time  
4 she worked. *Id.*

5 Accordingly, Plaintiff said that she would rather not cover both positions and declined to take  
6 over Gray's position unless USPS provided a replacement Delivery Service Supervisor. *See id.* ¶ 19.  
7 Instead, the manager positions was given to Anthony Jarmon, who had previously worked at the  
8 Airport Finance Station. *Id.* ¶ 20.

9 Jarmon did not show up for work on August 20, 2009 and did not return until September 16.  
10 *Id.* ¶ 21. With Jarmon and Gray out, Ms. Wingate had to cover for the manager and also fill three  
11 supervisor positions until the next week when Gray returned from vacation. *Id.* ¶¶ 21-24.<sup>7</sup>

12 Ms. Wingate also alleges that she received a letter stating that she would be put on leave without  
13 pay ("LWOP") until notified to return to work. *Id.* ¶ 25. The letter stated that after 14 days, she  
14 would be put on administrative leave. *Id.* Instead, Ms. Wingate was "carried on LWOP and  
15 AWOL" for two years. *Id.* She also was denied use of her leave for seven months and was refused  
16 paid leave on "numerous occasions." *See id.* ¶¶ 26; 29.

17 Ms. Wingate also alleges that Gray had acting manager Dayao falsify Ms. Wingate's attendance  
18 record so that she would be issued a letter of removal for being absent without leave. *Id.* ¶ 27. Gray  
19 and Manager Orozco-Boldware "[c]onspired to have Acting Postmaster Hartenstein issue the  
20 falsified Letter of Removal." *Id.*

21 The FAC also alleges that at some point, Ms. Wingate had been out on sick leave. *Id.* ¶ 28.  
22 When she returned, two managers conspired to reassign her from the Embarcadero Postal Center to a  
23 relief position at three different stations. *Id.* The relief position was at stations that were considered  
24 less desirable. *Id.*

25 Finally, Ms. Wingate alleges, on information and belief, that "persons who are not of her

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>7</sup> The FAC does not explain why Ms. Wingate had to cover four (rather than two) supervisor  
positions.

1 particular persuasions have not received such treatment.” *Id.* ¶ 30.

2 **B. Wingate II**

3 **1. EEO Proceedings Related to Wingate II**

4 On September 7, 2012, Ms. Wingate filed the EEO complaint underlying *Wingate II* with the  
5 USPS’s EEO office. *See* Desorbo Decl. Ex. A, ECF No. 16-2. She alleged that she had been  
6 discriminated against on the basis of her race, national origin, sex, and age, and subjected to  
7 retaliation based on her prior EEO activity. *See* FAC, ECF No. 15; Desorbo Decl. Ex. A. Ms.  
8 Wingate later added additional allegations of discrimination based on the USPS allegedly forcing  
9 her to retire. FAC ¶ 4. The alleged discrimination occurred when:

10 (1) USPS denied Ms. Wingate’s requests for leave on unspecified dates over the previous  
11 three years;

12 (2) Manager Sharon Gray invaded Ms. Wingate’s privacy by opening, delaying, and  
13 intercepting Ms. Wingate’s mail and sharing the information with others;

14 (3) her manager signed a form obligating Ms. Wingate to pay for health and life insurance  
15 during a period when she had been on leave without pay status;

16 (4) the USPS denied Ms. Wingate’s August 17, 2012 request for information;

17 (5) Ms. Wingate was incorrectly rated on her 2009, 2010, and 2011 Pay for Performance  
18 reviews;

19 (6) on August 29, 2011, Ms. Wingate’s request to have absences changed to sick leave was  
20 denied;

21 (7) Ms. Wingate had not received an interest payment ordered in a Merit Systems Protection  
22 Board (“MSPB”) Order in a different case; and

23 (8) Ms. Wingate’s manager issued her a Letter of Debt Determination in the amount of  
24 \$1,327.32 by a manager.

25 *See* Desorbo Decl. Ex. B.

26 On March 26, 2013, the USPS issued a Final Agency Decision that “the evidence does not  
27 support a finding that the complainant was subjected to discrimination as alleged.” *Id.* Ex. E.

28 The complainant alleged discriminatory harassment beginning April 13, 2012, based on Race  
(Black African American), Religion (Baptist), National Origin (American), Sex (Female),  
Age ([redacted]) and Retaliation (Prior EEO Activity) when:

29 1. On unspecified dates, her leave requests were denied;

30 2. On unspecified dates, management invaded her privacy by opening mail addressed to her  
31 and sharing information with others;

1       3. On August 17, 2012, her request for information was denied;  
2       4. On unspecified dates, she was rated incorrectly on her 2011 Pay for Performance reviews;  
3       5. On August 29, 2011, her request to have absences changed to sick leave was not approved  
4       and  
5       6. Effective July 3, 2012, she was forced to retire.

6 *Id.*

7       **2. *Wingate II* in Federal Court**

8       On April 16, 2013, Ms. Wingate appealed the agency's *Wingate II* decision by filing suit in this  
9 court. *See Wingate II*, Complaint, ECF No. 1. In her original complaint, Ms. Wingate alleged  
10 discrimination on the basis or race or color, sex, and national origin. The discrimination claims were  
11 roughly based on the factual allegations addressed in the *Wingate II* final agency decision. In  
12 addition, the complaint and its attachments contained references to numerous other claims including  
13 defamation, "hostility and disrespect," invasion of privacy, and extortion. *See id.*

14       On May 14, 20123 the court related this case to *Wingate I*. ECF No. 3. Then on June 17, 2013,  
15 the USPS moved to dismiss this case. *See* ECF No. 9. On July 23, 2013, the court granted the  
16 USPS's motion to dismiss for the same reasons discussed in the *Wingate I* order of the same date.  
17 *See Wingate II*, Order, ECF No. 13.

18       Ms. Wingate filed the operative FAC on August 14, 2013. ECF No. 15. As in *Wingate I*, the  
19 FAC alleges five Title VII claims for discrimination based on race, national origin, sex, color, and  
20 hostile work environment. *See* FAC, ECF No. 15, ¶¶ 25-45. The complaint makes the following  
21 factual allegations:

22       (1) the USPS denied Ms. Wingate's requests for leave on unspecified dates from 2009 to 2012;  
23       (2) Manager Gray invaded Ms. Wingate's privacy by intercepting, opening, delaying, and  
24 sharing the contents of Ms. Wingate's mail;  
25       (3) Ms. Wingate's manager signed a form that obligated Ms. Wingate to pay for health and life  
26 insurance for the period when she had been on leave without pay;  
27       (4) the USPS denied Ms. Wingate's August 17, 2012 request for information;  
28       (5) Ms. Wingate was incorrectly rated on her 2009-2011 pay for performance reviews;

1 (6) on August 29, 2011, Ms. Wingate's request to have her absences changed to sick leave was  
2 denied;  
3 (7) the USPS knowingly sent Ms. Wingate's checks to the wrong address;  
4 (8) Manager Gray denied Ms. Wingate's request regarding a "corrected form 3972;"  
5 (9) Ms. Wingate was docked \$2,172.40 to cover "discrepancies" at the Embarcadero station,  
6 though such discrepancies were normally ignored; and  
7 (10) after Ms. Wingate asked the USPS to roll over one of her IRAs, it failed to do so.

8 FAC ¶¶ 15-23.

### 9 **C. Current Procedural Posture of *Wingate I* and *Wingate II***

10 On August 28, 2013, the USPS filed the pending motions to dismiss in both cases *See Wingate I*,  
11 ECF No. 26; *Wingate II*, ECF No. 16. Ms. Wingate did not oppose either motion by the deadline, so  
12 the court ordered her to either oppose the motions by September 23, or show cause why these  
13 matters should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Wingate I*, Order to Show Cause, ECF  
14 No. 27; *Wingate II*, Order to Show Cause, ECF No. 17. Ms. Wingate filed a consolidated opposition  
15 in both cases on September 23, and the USPS filed a consolidated reply on September 25, 2013.

## 16 ANALYSIS

### 17 **I. LEGAL STANDARDS**

#### 18 **A. Rule 12(b)(1)**

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) permits defendants to move for dismissal of a  
20 complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Because a plaintiff seeks to invoke federal  
21 jurisdiction by filing a complaint in federal court, a plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that  
22 jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994);  
23 *Farmers Ins. Exchange v. Portage La Prairie Mut. Ins. Co.*, 907 F.2d 911, 912 (9th Cir. 1990).  
24 Hence, a plaintiff must plead sufficient facts in the complaint to establish the court's jurisdiction  
25 Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1).

26 A defendant may mount either a facial or a factual challenge to the court's jurisdiction *See White*  
27 *v. Lee*, 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000). A facial attack asserts that the lack of federal  
28 jurisdiction appears on the face of the complaint. *See Warren v. Fox Family Worldwide, Inc.*, 328

1 F.3d 1136, 1139 (9th Cir. 2003). In this context, a court must “accept all allegations of fact in the  
2 complaint as true and construe them in the light most favorable to the plaintiffs.” *See id.* In  
3 contrast, with a factual challenge, courts do not accept as true all facts in a plaintiff’s complaint and  
4 may evaluate extrinsic evidence and resolve factual disputes when necessary. *See Roberts v.*  
5 *Corrothers*, 812 F.2d 1173, 1177 (9th Cir. 1987) (quoting *Augustine v. United States*, 704 F.2d  
6 1074, 1077 (9th Cir. 1983)). Where a defendant asserts a factual challenge by presenting affidavits  
7 or other evidence, the party opposing the motion must present sufficient evidence to support the  
8 court’s subject-matter jurisdiction. *See Savage v. Glendale Union High School, Dist. No. 205,*  
9 *Maricopa County*, 343 F.3d 1036, 1040 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2003). Dismissal of a complaint without leave  
10 to amend should be granted only where the jurisdictional defect cannot be cured by amendment.  
11 *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003).

12 **B. Rule 12(b)(6)**

13 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) provides that a defendant may move to dismiss a claim  
14 for “failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” A motion to dismiss under Rule  
15 12(b)(6) “tests the legal sufficiency of a claim.” *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir.  
16 2001). In order to survive a motion to dismiss, a plaintiff must allege “enough facts to state a claim  
17 to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A  
18 claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw  
19 the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
20 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). “The plausibility standard is not akin to a ‘probability requirement,’  
21 but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Id.* (quoting  
22 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557). In considering a motion to dismiss, a court must accept all of the  
23 plaintiff’s allegations as true. *Id.* at 550; *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93-94 (2007). The  
24 plaintiff’s complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, but it must contain more than a  
25 “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. “Threadbare  
26 recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not  
27 suffice.” *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949. In reviewing a motion to dismiss, courts may also consider  
28 documents attached to the complaint. *Parks School of Business, Inc. v. Symington*, 51 F.3d 1480,

1 1484 (9th Cir. 1995) (citation omitted). Additionally, courts may consider a matter that is properly  
2 the subject of judicial notice, such as matters of public record. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d  
3 668, 688 (9th Cir. 2001).

4 **II. USPS'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CLAIMS IN WINGATE I**

5 **A. Ms. Wingate's Amended Claims Fail**

6 The USPS moves to dismiss Ms. Wingate's Title VII claims for the same two reasons the court  
7 granted its previous motion to dismiss. First, it argues that the court should dismiss any  
8 discrimination claims that were not part of Ms. Wingate's MSPB complaint for failure to exhaust  
9 administrative remedies. *See Motion*, ECF No. 26 at 11-13. Second, to the extent that Ms. Wingate  
10 exhausted administrative remedies, her discrimination and hostile work environment claims fail to  
11 state claims upon which relief can be granted. *Id.* at 13-14. For both reasons, the court dismisses  
12 Ms. Wingate's discrimination claims.

13 **1. Ms. Wingate Has Not Exhausted Her Administrative Remedies**

14 The USPS argues that the court lacks jurisdiction to hear the Title VII discrimination claims that  
15 Ms. Wingate did not raise before the MSPB. *See id.* at 11-13. Ms. Wingate does not respond to this  
16 argument. *See Opp'n*, ECF No. 28. The court previously set forth the applicable legal standard and  
17 explained that exhaustion of administrative remedies is a jurisdictional prerequisite. *See Order*, ECF  
18 No. 23 at 7-9. The same standard applies to the FAC.

19 Ms. Wingate's EEO complaint did not allege that she was asked to simultaneously cover the  
20 manager and supervisor positions, FAC ¶ 16-17, that she had to work hours for which she was not  
21 compensated, FAC ¶ 18, or that she was improperly reassigned to a relief position, FAC ¶ 28. The  
22 court, therefore, lacks jurisdiction to hear claims based on these allegations. Stated differently, the  
23 law does not permit Ms. Wingate to raise claims in this court based on allegations that she did not  
24 present in her EEO proceeding. Accordingly, to the extent Ms. Wingate's claims are based on the  
25 allegations in paragraphs 16-18 and 28 of her complaint, they are dismissed.

26 **2. The FAC Fails to State a Claim For Employment Discrimination**

27 The USPS also moves to dismiss as insufficiently pleaded Ms. Wingate's employment  
28 discrimination claims. Motion at 13-15. Ms. Wingate does not address the USPS's arguments (that

1 the complaint does not include sufficient allegations) and instead her opposition is a narrative of her  
2 grievances with various USPS managers. *See Opp'n*, ECF No. 28, *passim*.

3 To establish a prima facie case of employment discrimination under Title VII, Ms. Wingate must  
4 prove that (1) she belongs to a protected class, (2) she was qualified for the position, (3) she was  
5 subject to an adverse employment action, and (4) similarly-situated individuals outside her protected  
6 class were treated more favorably. *See Leong v. Potter*, 347 F.3d 1117, 1124 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing  
7 *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, 802 (1973)). Though heightened pleading  
8 standards are not mandated in Title VII cases, Ms. Wingate must plead sufficient facts to state the  
9 elements of a prima facie case of discrimination. *Johnson v. Riverside Healthcare System, LP*, 534  
10 F.3d 1116, 1122 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *Williams v. Boeing Co.*, 517 F.3d 1120, 1130 (9th Cir.  
11 2008)).

12 As discussed, the court has jurisdiction only over claims based on the allegations that Ms.  
13 Wingate presented to the EEO. Those allegations are that Ms. Wingate was (1) denied sick leave  
14 and forced to take leave without pay, (2) placed in off-duty status without pay for refusing to accept  
15 a new job assignment, and (3) removed from the USPS for being absent without leave. *See MSPB*  
16 *Initial Decision*, Tam Decl. Ex. D; *MSPB Final Decision*, Tam Decl. Ex. E.

17 Here, the FAC fails to allege facts showing that similarly-situated individuals outside Ms.  
18 Wingate's protected class were treated more favorably. The closest allegation is that “[o]n  
19 information and belief Plaintiff alleges that persons who are not of her particular persuasions have  
20 not received such treatment.” FAC ¶ 30. That is the sole discrimination allegation related to the  
21 claims that the court has jurisdiction to consider.<sup>8</sup> But this vague and conclusory statement is

---

23       <sup>8</sup> The FAC also alleges that none of other replacement managers were African-American or  
24 black and that they were not asked to fill both manager and delivery service supervisor positions at  
25 the same time. *See FAC ¶¶ 16-17*. As discussed, the court lacks jurisdiction to consider that claim.

26 Ms. Wingate's opposition also contains allegations that specific employees of different races  
27 were treated differently than she. *See Opp'n* at 5, 7, 24, 29. As the court explained when dismissing  
28 Ms. Wingate's original complaint, on a motion to dismiss the court considers only the factual  
allegations in the complaint and not additional allegations in the opposition brief. *See Order*, ECF  
No. 23 at 4 n.5. Nonetheless, the factual allegations in Ms. Wingate's opposition would not change

1 unsupported by factual allegations. Accordingly, the court grants the USPS's motion to dismiss  
2 claims one through four in the FAC.

3 **3. The FAC Fails to State a Title VII Claim For a Hostile Work Environment**

4 Next, the USPS moves to dismiss Ms. Wingate's fifth claim for hostile work environment as  
5 insufficiently pleaded. Motion at 14. Ms. Wingate's opposition does not address the USPS's  
6 argument.

7 The elements of a Title VII hostile work environment discrimination claim based on race or sex  
8 are that the plaintiff (1) was subjected to verbal or physical conduct of a racial or sexual nature; (2)  
9 the conduct was unwelcome; and (3) the conduct was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the  
10 conditions of the plaintiff's employment and create an abusive work environment. *Vasquez v.*  
11 *County of Los Angeles*, 349 F.3d 634, 642 (9th Cir. 2003).

12 Here, the FAC is devoid of allegations as to any of these elements. *See* FAC. Accordingly, the  
13 court grants the USPS's motion to dismiss.

14 **II. USPS'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CLAIMS IN WINGATE II**

15 The court's earlier order addressed almost all of these allegations, and the FAC adds nothing to  
16 them. *Compare* Order, ECF No. 13, *with*, FAC, ECF No. 15. To the extent the FAC purports to  
17 state Title VII claims for discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, it fails for the same reason the  
18 same claims fail in *Wingate I*: there are no allegations linking any adverse employment actions with  
19 either a discriminatory or retaliatory motivation. *See* Order, ECF No. 13 at 5. And as in *Wingate I*,  
20 the FAC states no allegations to support a Title VII hostile work environment claim. As discussed  
21 with regard to *Wingate I*, Ms. Wingate states on information and belief only that "persons who are  
22 not of her particular persuasions have not received such treatment." FAC ¶ 23. This conclusory  
23 allegation is insufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss. Thus, the court grants the USPS's motion  
24 to dismiss all five of the claims specifically alleged in the FAC.

25 Liberally construed, the FAC appears to reallege additional claims, all of which the court  
26

---

27 the outcome of this case because Ms. Wingate did not exhaust administrative remedies as to any  
28 discrimination claims that could arise out of those allegations.

1 previously dismissed. First, to the extent the FAC attempts to state tort claims predicated on  
2 employment discrimination, they are barred for the reasons previously discussed. *See id.* at 5.  
3 Second, to the extent the complaint alleges other tort claims, they are barred either by sovereign  
4 immunity or because Ms. Wingate did not exhaust administrative remedies under the FTCA.

5 Finally, the court previously dismissed claims based on allegations related to a failure to promote  
6 Ms. Wingate or the refusal to roll over her IRA because Ms. Wingate failed to exhaust  
7 administrative remedies regarding these claims. *See Order*, ECF No. 13 at 4-5. The FAC contains  
8 no new allegations that would support different conclusions.<sup>9</sup>

9 **III. LEAVE TO AMEND**

10 Finally, the USPS asks the court to dismiss Ms. Wingate's claims with prejudice (in  
11 other words, without leave to amend). Generally, if the court dismisses the complaint, it "should  
12 grant leave to amend even if no request to amend the pleading was made, unless it determines that  
13 the pleading could not possibly be cured by the allegation of other facts." *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d  
14 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000). But when a party repeatedly fails to cure deficiencies, the court may  
15 order dismissal without leave to amend. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1261 (9th Cir. 1992)  
16 (affirming dismissal with prejudice where district court had instructed *pro se* plaintiff regarding  
17 deficiencies in prior order dismissing claim with leave to amend).

18 As in *Ferdik*, this court previously instructed Ms. Wingate regarding the deficiencies in her  
19 original complaint and what she must allege to survive a motion to dismiss. The FAC fails to correct  
20 any of these deficiencies. Accordingly, the court dismisses Ms. Wingate's claims with prejudice  
21 (without leave to amend).

22 **CONCLUSION**

23 For the reasons discussed above, the court **GRANTS** the USPS's motions to dismiss and  
24 dismisses the First Amended Complaints in Civil Case Nos. 12-05660 LB and 13-01722 LB **WITH**  
25 **PREJUDICE**.

26  
27  
28 <sup>9</sup> The court's finding is based on the insufficiency of this allegation and does not rely on the  
USPS's interpretation of the law of the case doctrine. *See Wingate II*, Motion, ECF No. 16 at 12.

1 This disposes of ECF No. 26 in Case No. 12-05660 LB and ECF No. 16 in Case No. 13-01722  
2 LB.

3 The clerk of court shall close the files.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: September 26, 2013

  
LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge